

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 650

JC 730 028

AUTHOR Rogers, Ida Long
TITLE The Improvement of Instruction in Developing Junior Colleges.
INSTITUTION Freed-Hardeman Coll., Henderson, Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Higher Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Coll. Support.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 35p.
AVAILABLE FROM Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tennessee 38340
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Guides; *College Faculty; College Instruction; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Effective Teaching; Faculty Evaluation; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Junior Colleges; Program Descriptions; Remedial Instruction; Student Teacher Relationship; Teaching Methods; Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

This monograph describes Freed-Hardeman College's effort to improve instruction through a cooperative project with the faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers. The report is intended to be useful to other developing colleges. The faculty development project, mostly funded under the Title III Higher Education Act of 1965, consisted of summer and extended study leaves, faculty travel to professional meetings, interinstitutional visits by faculty members of the two institutions, and consultation by visiting scholars and specialists. The report concentrates on the 1969-70 program. In an effort to organize the report around concerns common to developing colleges in general, visiting scholars' recommendations are grouped under the topics of purpose, faculty development, student-faculty relations, and instructional methods. Recommendations included an emphasis on education rather than training and more active participation by the learner, which requires a new and more active role for the professor. Appendix A provides a list of institutional coordinators, visiting scholars, and faculty participants. Appendix B is an annotated bibliography about teaching in the junior college. (KM)

ED 071658

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

*The Improvement of Instruction
in Developing Junior Colleges*

IDA LONG ROGERS
Professor of Higher Education
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee

JC 130 028

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 16 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

FREED-HARDEMAN COLLEGE Henderson, Tennessee

FREED-HARDEMAN COLLEGE
Faculty Development Project

Grant No. 187 (NIH 83-2615)
Developing Institutions Program, Division of College Support
U.S. Office of Education
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The project described herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Developing Institutions Program, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Freed-Hardeman College is indebted to Dr. Ida Long Rogers, Professor of Higher Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, for her assistance in several faculty and curriculum development projects supported under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. As program coordinator for Peabody, she has participated in the planning, execution, and evaluation of bilateral arrangements for increasing the level of academic preparation and instructional effectiveness of the Freed-Hardeman College faculty through summer and extended study leaves, faculty travel to professional meetings, interinstitutional visits by faculty members of the two institutions, and consultation by visiting scholars and specialists.

The college wishes also to thank Dr. John Claunch, Peabody president, for making Dr. Rogers' services available and Dr. Willa B. Player and the staff of the Division of College Support, U.S. Office of Education, for continuing grant support and for assistance in program planning and budgeting. The aid received has had an identifiable and measurable impact on strengthening Freed-Hardeman College as a developing institution.

J. D. Thomas
Academic Dean

Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, Tennessee

FOREWORD

This monograph seeks to describe one developing institution's effort to improve the quality of instruction and so to enhance the learning opportunities of its students. The period covered is largely between the academic years 1967-68 and 1970-71, with major attention given to the cooperative project implemented during 1969-70. It is hoped that some of the ideas examined, the activities pursued, and the directions taken might be useful to other developing institutions.

Copies may be requested from the author or from Freed-Hardeman College.

I. L. R.

1. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT—ONE INSTITUTION'S PLAN

The developing concept is one which is found in much of the current literature. Eugene Stalley defines an underdeveloped country as:

"A country characterized by (1) mass poverty which is chronic and not the result of some temporary misfortune, and by (2) obsolete methods of production and social organization, which means that the poverty is not entirely due to poor natural resources and hence could presumably be lessened by methods already proved in other countries. . . . Underdeveloped countries vary widely in their needs, resources, social, political, and cultural institutions. They all have, however, one feature in common, namely that their actual property is considerably lower than what can be gained from their potential resources."¹

For years colleges have provided special programs for students who enter college with inadequate educational and social preparation to allow them to make maximal progress in their new educational environment. Such programs, once called remedial, are now considered to be developmental.

Lawrence C. Howard, in the preface to his publication, *The Developing Colleges Program: A Study of Title III Higher Education Act of 1965*, states, "Title III is unique among federal higher education enactments. It emphasizes the developing rather than the prestigious or populous institution. Its effort is to identify colleges that have a potential to make a substantial contribution to our higher educational resources."²

As with the developing nation, it is difficult to define what is meant by the developing institution. The bill itself simply states that it is intended to assist institutions which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of

¹ Eugene Stalley, *The Future of Underdeveloped Countries* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), p. 13.

² Lawrence C. Howard, *The Developing Colleges Program: A Study of Title III Higher Education Act of 1965* (Milwaukee: Institute of Human Relations, The University of Wisconsin, 1967), p. iii.

academic life. In the hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the 89th Congress, Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel identified the characteristics of such institutions as follows:

- (1) A developing institution has limited financial support, a small endowment, and alumni and friends with limited capital to offer.
- (2) It usually has relatively high dropout and transfer rates. These may often stem from poor admissions policy, but whatever the cause, the result is often a course of study heavy with remedial work and light on challenging assignments.
- (3) It will likely have a slim catalog of offerings within minimum programs. In some smaller institutions, one or two faculty members may constitute a total academic department.
- (4) It can boast of little in the way of laboratories, libraries, or other instructional facilities identified with higher education. . . . Some *danger signs* are the following: Less than 50,000 books in the library for an enrollment of 600 students; less than 3 professional librarians on the staff; a library budget of less than 5 cents of the total school budget dollar expended. (Half of our 4-year schools have less than the required 50,000 volumes; more than half of all our institutions of higher education fail in the other respects.)
- (5) It has difficulty in attracting faculty members of high quality and cannot hold those it does manage to attract. Such weaknesses are especially apparent among those institutions with fewer than 200 full-time instructors. Fewer have attained doctoral degrees; and their average annual earnings are nearly \$1,500 less than those of their colleagues in the universities and stronger colleges, and about \$700 less than instructors in all 4-year institutions. The faculty members of such institutions normally are called upon to shoulder heavier teaching loads than their colleagues elsewhere in higher education, with the result that they conduct less original research, publish fewer books, and present fewer professional papers and articles.³

Commissioner Keppel's description referred more specifically to four-year institutions, but the details could have been translated to the needs of the developing two year college. Whether one is talking about developing nations, students, institutions, or faculties, the concept is the same. The potential is yet unfulfilled. An institution which seeks assistance under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 must first establish the basis for defining itself as a developing institution. It then must show its interest and intent to improve.

³ Hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee of Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 1st Session on H.R. 3220, Chairman Adam C. Powell, p. 39.

Freed-Hardeman College

Past as Prologue

As a 60-year-old institution, Freed-Hardeman College has a faculty diverse in age, graduate preparation, and degree of professional involvement in the activities of academic societies and other educational associations. In 1964-65, no instructor held an earned doctorate, although some had a year or more of study beyond the master's degree. A 1966 survey showed that less than half of the faculty had attended a professional meeting in the preceding five years. The college was below the minimum level of degree achievement required by the regional accrediting association. Support and encouragement of advanced study and professional travel had been limited.

In 1966 the college set aside \$10,000 for faculty development, an amount which was doubled in 1967. Support for advanced study was increased from half tuition to half salary, still a modest amount for instructors with only a master's degree (the minimum salary that year was \$5,200). Instructors on leave were forced to supplement their grants with half-time teaching assistantships or outside employment, delaying the completion of their program and the establishment of their residence. In the fiscal year 1967, a major grant of \$90,712 was received from the Developing Institutions Branch for expenditure in 1967-68. This was used, along with \$55,291 in direct and indirect institutional expenditures, to support a broad-scale, multi-pronged program for faculty development. Twenty-one instructors studied in twelve graduate schools. Overall faculty degree achievement was raised from below 40 percent to nearly 50 percent with two or more years of graduate study (counting the degree achievement of National Teaching Fellows and faculty on leave). Instructors participated in thirty-two professional meetings, reporting to departmental faculty meetings upon their return. Eleven of the thirteen departments established interinstitutional contacts with corresponding George Peabody College for Teachers departments through visiting the Peabody campus or inviting Peabody professors to the Freed-Hardeman campus.

Federal funding of the faculty development program was not renewed for 1968-69. However, cooperation between Freed-Hardeman and Peabody College continued on a limited basis. Thirty-five thousand dollars of college funds were expended by Freed-Hardeman for continued faculty development.

In 1969-70 Freed-Hardeman budgeted almost \$39,000 for faculty development.

The program funded by the Developing Institutions Branch in the fiscal year 1969 was an extension of the earlier successful cooperative arrangement with Peabody College, seeking to further strengthen instruction in the various academic disciplines at Freed-Hardeman College and providing for full-year leaves for four and summer support for ten faculty members.

Programs which are granted federal support and are cooperative in nature carry with them an obligation to be mutually beneficial to the developing and the assisting institutions. The program for 1969-70 sought to extend the benefits beyond the two participating institutions by bringing ten of the graduate professors under whom the instructors were studying in the summer or on year leaves to the developing institution campus for three visits of one to three days, thus acquainting them with the needs and challenges faced by teachers in small, isolated institutions. In addition, a report entitled *On Teaching in a Developing Junior College* was to be prepared for dissemination to graduate professors, prospective National Teaching Fellows, and others teaching or preparing to teach in developing institutions. This monograph is designed to serve that purpose, but seeks to provide information beyond a description of that one year's program.

The program called for the following procedures:

- a. An initial conference to be held in early fall to acquaint the professors with the institution and with the goals of the project.
- b. Individual visits to be arranged with the appropriate departments during which the graduate professor would meet with the department faculties, would review the curricula, course outlines, facilities, equipment, and library collections, and would visit classes as an observer or a participant in lecture-discussions, becoming acquainted with the students at work.
- c. A final conference to be held in the late spring to share and interact on observations and recommendations submitted by the visiting scholars.

It was Peabody's responsibility to secure the cooperation of the visiting scholars, participate in the initial and final conference, and prepare the manuscript for publication. A list of the institutional coordinators, visiting scholars, and participating faculty members is included in the appendix of this report.

Fall Conference

In October 1969, the visiting scholars and participating faculty were brought together on the campus of Freed-Hardeman College for an

initial orientation to the college, its character and purposes, its students and its faculty, and the purposes of the faculty development program. In the keynote address to the Faculty Development Conference, Dorothy Knoell, Chancellor's Staff, Sacramento, California, recognized that many of the characteristics of the developing colleges were those most sought by community college students around the country. Students with whom she had talked had said that the kind of school which they would like to attend would be medium to small, would offer a liberal arts curriculum with a faculty and staff interested in teaching, would be located away from urban ills, and would provide a chance for service. Such institutions do exist, but their future, like that of the community college, is uncertain. Dr. Knoell suggested that if such institutions are to have a future, and if they are to be effective, ways must be found:

1. to achieve excellence without exclusiveness
2. to make liberal education more relevant
3. to truly care for students
4. to give service to the community, however defined
5. to attract and hold good faculty and staff
6. to provide for orderly growth in enrollment, curriculum, and services.

As have most others, Dr. Knoell acknowledged money as a real problem, for good staff retention and improvement, new equipment and facilities, and the like all take money. A caution was offered. Don't exclude those who need you.

In addition to the problem of money, both the junior college and the community college share other problems and questions which must be answered if the institutions are to fulfill the potential which is theirs. They are as follows:

- a. How do we assess effectiveness? How do we know when we are doing better or less well, and in relation to what and why? Our efforts to date tend to take two extreme forms: How well do we like a course (program, study)? To what extent do we achieve our behavioral objectives? While the latter is an improvement, neither is very adequate. The first functions only at the feeling level and the second at the coldly objective statistical level. Somehow we need to incorporate both feeling and data.
- b. What are we doing for our students who do not go on to a baccalaureate degree and who are unprepared for a vocation? Are we providing for occupational counseling, placement, continuing education? How can we prepare our students for the world of

work, while avoiding costly specialized curricula? Are we making the best use of social service curricula and others without expensive facilities?

- c. How well are we succeeding with our least able students? What can we do to improve?
- d. How are we adjusting curriculum to the changing needs of individuals and society while maintaining necessary stability?
- e. How can we serve our local communities upon whom we are dependent and by whom we may be resented? How can we best serve our more remote communities—churches, alumni, friends?
- f. How can we make sure we stay student-centered, not content- or institution-centered. How can student services contribute to this?

Each institution must seek its own answers. The answers are not simple, but some of the solutions are suggested in exemplary programs and services—community projects, remedial courses, international projects, in-service training, cooperation with other educational institutions, inner-city and disadvantaged concerns.

Still other questions face all institutions: how to implement concepts of service to the community, develop skills, firm up self-concepts; how to institutionalize the “service to students” concepts with the college life and operation; how to provide a better bridge from home to life; how to keep faculty “refreshed” academically and otherwise; how to develop cooperative arrangements which are mutually beneficial.

At the close of the conference, Dr. Ralph Kirkman, Professor of Higher Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, examined some of the trends and directions in the junior college curriculum. He stated that the church-related junior college’s search for identity and for a significant and meaningful role in the teaching-learning process is related directly to its prospects for vital survival. The need for a careful and intensive study of the curriculum and for serious attention to significant curriculum issues was recognized. He identified some of the major issues needing consideration as follows:

- 1. Should general and liberal education receive primary attention, or should the acquisition of specialized competence be the major goal?
- 2. Should part of all of the student’s program be prescribed, or should he be free within certain broad limits to choose his own courses?
- 3. Should the curriculum be developed entirely along traditional subject-matter lines, or should certain diagnosed life needs guide in the selection and organization of the planned learning

experiences of the student?

4. Should the curriculum be organized on a conventional departmental basis, or should certain broad groupings of related areas be considered?
5. Should the formal provision for general education be largely confined to traditional college parallel courses, or should more attention be given to the specific needs of students as indicated in studies reporting the unique characteristics of junior college students?
6. Should learning experiences be selected and organized to cover a field of knowledge, or should they be designed to deal with issues and problems in a relevant and significant manner?
7. Should degree and program requirements be defined in terms of a certain number of course credits, or should the quality and level of a student's performance on comprehensive tests be a determining factor?
8. What are the separate roles of faculty and students in curriculum planning?

Outstanding programs which have been developed to answer these and other questions were identified, not to be copied, but to suggest approaches which could be adapted to meet Freed-Hardeman's needs. Dr. Kirkman stated that generally junior colleges require a core of common studies but they need to recognize the necessity of flexibility, especially for the noncollege-bound student. He cited the Florida approach to general education which consists of a modest core but focuses attention on the needs of the individual.

Since it was recognized that traditionally junior colleges admit a considerable number of low-achieving students, a developmental approach to teaching was encouraged. An example of such a program can be found at Forest Park Community College of St. Louis, Missouri. In its general studies curriculum for the disadvantaged, provision is made for teaching basic academic skills in reading, English, and mathematics while assisting the individual student to acquire personal enrichment and to adjust to self and to society. Daytona Beach Junior College has a special program of guided studies for students with notable deficiencies in academic skills. Lake City Junior College has developed a variety of instructional materials for teaching reading to low-achieving students. The program is based on the assumption that standard English is a "second language" to such students. At Brevard Junior College low-achieving students have courses scheduled on a five-day-a-week basis rather than the traditional three-day-a-week plan.

It is essential that the approach be developmental rather than remedial.

While cooperative work-study education attempts are not new to higher education, they are relatively new to the junior college and the American Association of Junior Colleges has expressed serious interest in this approach to education. Although financial advantages to students should not be overlooked, such should not be the primary emphasis. The Loop Campus of Chicago City College is located in the heart of the Chicago business district where students work half a day and take courses during the rest of the day. At the College of San Mateo of San Mateo, California, the student attends classes for a semester and then is assigned to work opportunity, alternating his study and work responsibilities. Work-study programs could be provided by most developing institutions in business, industry, government agencies, health services, and social and welfare work, utilizing local agencies and those in nearby metropolitan areas.

Programmed instruction and self-instructional programs afford many opportunities for curricular enrichment in both developmental areas and in the traditional academic disciplines, and they do not have to be expensive. Many junior colleges are beginning to use students as "teachers." Students have some definite advantages in communicating with other students. Many tutorial services are provided by abler and interested students, extending the orientation process throughout the full academic year.

The challenge to the developing college is to clearly identify its academic role and to respond creatively to significant curricular issues. This was the challenge left with the visiting scholars, the faculty participants, and the administrators of Freed-Hardeman College.

Scholars' Visits and Reports

Shortly after the fall conference a letter was sent by the two coordinators to the graduate faculty members concerning their scheduled visits. They were told again that the primary concern was for the improvement of instruction at Freed-Hardeman, but that it was hoped that some of the suggestions and observations which they would make would be relevant to other developing institutions. Therefore, they were asked to make their report in two parts. The instructions read:

Part I—an evaluation and recommendations for the improvement of faculty, facilities (classrooms, laboratories, library holdings, etc.), and instructional programs and procedures. We hope that these will be candid and concise, and accompanied wherever possible with specific and realistic suggestions.

Part II—a consideration of a series of questions which have been examined while on campus with your graduate student and with the departmental faculty which may generate ideas that will contribute to the improvement of Freed-Hardeman, and which might also merit consideration by other institutions. We recognize that you cannot address yourselves to all of these questions in a short visit. Some may not be appropriate for your discipline. We hope that the clusters of questions may be helpful in making your discussion more meaningful and productive. Those of you who were with us in early October will recognize some of these questions which were raised by Dr. Dorothy Knoell.

1. To what extent has the department or have individual faculty members attempted to establish behavioral objectives for programs and courses? What knowledge, understandings, and attitude do they consider to be important for students to acquire?
2. To what extent does the curriculum reflect these objectives? How has the curriculum been adjusted to meet the changing needs of society? Is curriculum static? Has it changed, and how?
3. What is or can be done for students not going on immediately for the baccalaureate degree? Are there occupations into which these students may move? To what extent is occupational counseling available and adequate? What provisions could be made for placement services for these students?
4. How adequately are we succeeding with the least able students? What are we doing to make it possible for them to succeed? Are remedial, developmental programs desirable and feasible?
5. How can we better serve the various communities of the college: local, or the more remote communities of the church, alumni, and friends?
6. What provision is being made or could be made for continuing education or in-service training?
7. How can we make students socially aware of the world around them—local, national, and international?
8. How do we keep faculty refreshed and academically relevant?

If you consider other questions more important, please feel free to reflect on them and give us the benefit of your best thinking. We are appreciative of your willingness to work with us.

Copies of the report were provided each department and time was provided in the spring conference for discussion with the participating departmental faculties. Written reactions to the report were requested of each department.

As indicated earlier, any implied criticism of existing methods or programs and suggestions for improvement could be made of most departments and programs in most developing institutions. The visiting scholars indicated further that often the same criticisms and need for improvement could be found on their own campuses and in their own departments.

2. IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

Although the analysis of programs and recommendations were developed by the visiting scholars for the improvement of instruction for Freed-Hardeman College, they provide suggestions which are worthy of consideration by other colleges as well. Rather than report the findings in terms of academic disciplines, an effort is made in this section to organize the recommendations around common concerns related to purpose, faculty development, student-faculty relations, and instructional methods.

What Is It That We Are All About?

When at the Spring Conference the visiting scholars gathered to talk about their experience and to distill from it what might be said to all developing institutions, it was with the question of purpose that they began. One scholar forcefully expressed it:

I believe it was Robert Maynard Hutchins who some years ago made clear the distinction between training and education in American colleges. I would quickly assert that, unlike Mr. Hutchins, I believe there is a good case for training. If we consider the realities of American society today, we must admit that many, if not most, occupations require training; few require an education.

... Training is good. Done right, it teaches the trainee a respect for the tools of his trade. It makes him value technique, form. It is practical. It enables him to tackle a specific task for which he has been trained with some confidence that he knows the rules to be followed. *It is inadequate.*

It is inadequate for a plain and simple reason: You cannot train a student for life, but only for a specific occupation, a specific task. How wasted his training is if he never has occasion to use that for which he has been trained. *We must also educate.*⁴

Dr. Robert A. McQuitty gave form to his ideas by outlining a Freshman English course which would educate as well as train.

First, let's establish our objectives. Let's establish as our goal for training: primarily, a greater skill in writing than the student has when he enters the

⁴ Robert A. McQuitty, Excerpts from "Comments on the English Program at Freed-Hardeman College."

classroom and, secondarily, a greater skill in reading than he has when he enters. For our educational goals, let's assume that there is no "practical" reason anyone would want to be a better writer—except for professionals, good writing does not *pay off*. We want our students to be better writers because good writers are good thinkers. Through writing, a person finds out what he thinks, how *much* he has thought, how *clear* his thinking is, or how fuzzy. We want our students to be better writers because writing integrates the personality, gives the person a sense of self, helps him to mature, and so on—a notion difficult to express except in these fuzzy generalities. As another educational goal, we want our students to learn to communicate because that is what human beings do. Let's assume also that we want to develop attitudes in the student, an attitude, for one, that sees the use of language as a distinctly human activity, an attitude toward reading that enables the student to respond critically and creatively, an attitude toward writing that is creative.

These objectives would mean that we would not penalize a student for the lack of skill in writing he brings to the class. We can only *test* his ability to write at the end of the semester, not along the way. If we like, we can evaluate him along the way to help him tell how he is doing, but none of his struggles to write should be held against him—no grades please. Nothing is final until the end; we are interested in end products. And there is no reason why a student's final grade shouldn't be to some extent determined by how much improvement he has made, although I suspect we will want to have some kind of minimal writing standard.

To maintain some sort of writing standard, we will need to meet together and work out some standards. . . . What is needed is agreement about what makes good writing, not my criteria.

Once you have agreed, you can attempt to evaluate student writing objectively. Three times during the first semester (beginning, middle, end) have the students write a theme in class. Have it evaluated by two readers who do not know whose paper they are reading. Average the score and return it to the student. The first essay is diagnostic, the second gives you some basis for a mid-term report. The last tells you if the student is now a better writer than he was at the beginning of the semester. Let this be the major determining factor in the grade he receives.

Let the other major factor be a booklet of essays he will submit at the end of the semester. There can be a minimum number of essays, say six, and perhaps a maximum number, say ten. The booklet that he submits represents the *best* work, pieces that he has, hopefully, been working on all semester, pieces that he has submitted to you for suggestions on how to improve, pieces he has submitted to his classmates for suggestions. You will probably want him to write different kinds of things, so establish some categories. Let one piece be an argumentative essay, another a piece of exposition, another a personal-experience essay, another a piece that he has done some reading to develop (but not a documented paper), perhaps a comparison-contrast topic, perhaps a free category. He will be writing more than one essay in each category, because he wants to select his best essays to be turned in. What is in

this booklet should not come as a surprise to the instructor at the end of the semester. They will be essays he has been helping the student to improve all semester long. Let the student see that writing is a creative process, one that requires extensive revision if it is to be really good. Let the student realize that writing is communication, an expression of self to another person. Publish student essays during the semester by means of ditto. Encourage students to write for publication in the student newspaper, write letters to the editor of their hometown newspaper. If you get some really interesting writing, collect the work and publish a mimeographed booklet of best freshman writing. Nothing is more stimulating to the writer than publication.

Reading. All good writers read. But what do they read and why? They read primarily for ideas that will stimulate their own thinking. The premise behind the reading program I am suggesting is that the student must read what interests him, not what you assign in class. Encourage free reading by having the student submit a report every Friday on what he has read, just titles and authors and perhaps a brief comment, no elaborate "book report" or you're back in high school, killing the student's desire to read. You will also want to assign some reading of model essays, essays to be thoroughly studied, not for their ideas, but for their writing techniques. Probably there should be no more than a dozen of these, as short as is consistent with quality. Make clear that the reason for reading these essays is for the purpose of learning to write. . . .

What do you do in class? Anything that will help the students to be better writers. Every class should be a happening. You read student essays to the class. You point out good writing, and bad; but you must not harp on the bad. The student already knows that he can't write—show him that he can, if only haltingly. You may find that almost all the students are having trouble organizing their essays. Then teach a lesson on organizing. Teach mechanics if necessary, but for heaven's sake, don't start out to plod your way through your handbook. Refer the student to the handbook. Let him find the solutions to his writing problems if he can. You are his coach, not his judge. Certainly, you are no authority on writing. The best way to prove this to yourself and your class is to write with the students. Which is also the best way to find out what the student's problems are. Capitalize on the excellent student-teacher relationship at Freed-Hardeman by making student and teacher partners in this difficult business of learning to write better.

Students will of course be upset by such a Freshman English program—it's too real. It demands a real response from the students; it is not systemized; it may at times even be chaotic. But it frees both the student and the instructor; it frees the instructor from the drudgery of reading dull essays. It frees the student from the leash we too often place on his creative powers.

Such a program as I have sketchily outlined may sound wild and unworkable, and too "progressive," but it is education, not training only. I think it will work. It is the program I hope to have at Peabody next year.⁵

⁵ *Ibid.*

Faculty Development

It has been said that if you want to know in what an institution truly believes, you need only to look at its budget. The visiting scholars were aware of the fact that for a number of years Freed-Hardeman had allocated a significant portion of its budget to provide released time for faculty for graduate study. The level of federal support which has been made available has in large measure been possible because of this evidence of prior commitment.

An institution's commitment to the development of its faculty finds expression in many ways. It may seek to provide what Rensis Likert, in *New Patterns of Management*, describes as an integrating principle of supportive relationships:

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organization each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance.⁶

Likert goes on to say that:

The principle of supportive relationships points to a dimension essential for the success of every organization, namely, that the mission of the organization be seen by its members as genuinely important. To be highly motivated, each member of the organization must feel that the organization's objectives are of significance and that his own particular task contributes in an indispensable manner to the organization's achievement of its objectives. He should see his role as difficult, important, and meaningful. This is necessary if the individual is to achieve and maintain a sense of personal worth and importance.⁷

While Likert stated his principle in relation to government and industry, its application to the educational institution and to the developing junior college is evident. Those institutions which view teaching as central to their mission and the faculty as essential in the teaching-learning process are most likely to be supportive of the faculty in their search for growth and development. While it may be difficult at times to see that what is good for the factory worker is good for General Motors, it is readily apparent that what leads to growth of the faculty member is good for the institution. To the extent that the institution invests in the development of its faculty, it invests in its own good. Money provided for study leaves, for attendance at professional

⁶ Rensis Likert, *New Patterns of Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961), p. 103.

⁷ *Ibid.*

meetings, and for discussion and consultation with other professionals strengthens both the individual and the institution.

Specific areas of instruction within each department need to be clearly defined, and long-range planning should provide for the development of faculty proficiency in each area. Faculty members may be encouraged to develop specialities which will complement existing strengths. Some institutions seek to guarantee a return on their investment by providing that an individual faculty member by teaching a specified number of years in that institution may be excused from the repayment of a portion or all of the monies made available to him for advanced graduate study.

Still another means of faculty development, possibly less likely to bring direct returns to the institution, but worthy of consideration, is the early identification of students who should be encouraged to consider college teaching as a career. Students who have had a satisfying experience in the junior college may have more understanding than others of the contribution of this type of institution. There is little danger of inbreeding of the faculty when the students' subsequent education and professional training have of necessity been in one or more other colleges or universities.

One means of increasing the opportunity for enrichment for both students and faculty, is the deliberate recruitment of faculty members whose educational and geographic backgrounds vary widely. One of the weaknesses apparent in many developing institutions is the tendency to employ persons of like background, from the immediate area and from the same graduate institution. This is understandable since many graduate students seek experience and financial support by teaching in nearby colleges, making available to those developing colleges fortunate enough to be close to a graduate institution a ready supply of quality instructors. Diversity of experience and preparation makes possible a cross-fertilization of ideas both in and out of the classroom.

One other means of supporting and encouraging faculty members while they seek to enlarge their abilities is by providing on the campus an environment which is open to new ideas, new programs, and new and creative efforts. If when faculty are exposed to new or improved means of instruction the opportunity to implement their ideas is discouraged or denied, the faculty will be less willing to make the effort to change in the future. Certainly it must be recognized that all that is new is not good. However, no progress is made without change and students and faculty alike need to be freed to examine new ways of thinking and doing. Administrators and other faculty members who are

threatened by the new sometimes create an environment which discourages or stifles growth.

Because of limited finances, the developing institution may find itself tempted to assign to faculty members an excessive teaching load. Too many courses, too many different preparations, and too many students can only result in reduced time for study, preparation, and research. Thus, faculty and students suffer.

Faculty development achieves significance as the institution recognizes the importance of teaching, rewards those seeking to improve instruction, and creates a situation which encourages experimentation and innovation. At the same time, the institution seeks to minimize conditions which would limit the time and discourage the effort toward change. With all of this said, the growth of faculty is a personal thing which comes only in the end by expenditure of energy, time, and money by each individual. The completion of the terminal degree simply frees the faculty member of the obligation to meet the demands of others and imposes instead an inner discipline. Faculty development rests ultimately on the faculty.

Student-Faculty Relations

One of the virtues frequently extolled in college catalogs is the smallness of most of the church-related or private junior colleges. In a time of increasing enrollments, it is easy to forget that almost half of all of the colleges in the United States still have fewer than one thousand students. College recruiters speak of the closeness of student-faculty relationships and the intimacy of the small college community. It is true that such relationships may more readily be realized in the small college; but it is unwise to equate smallness with closeness and proximity with respect. Many small families are divided, neither caring nor concerned for their members. It is true that it is easy for one to lose oneself in bigness. The talented student may be overlooked in the class of two hundred; but he may be overlooked in the class of twenty if the instructor assumes that talent is not there to be found. The value of smallness may be lost if each member of the community does not consciously make the effort to capitalize on the potential for humanness.

It is essential that the institution gather needed information about its students—their abilities, their interests, their values, and their educational and professional goals. Because the student body is likely to be small, the faculty and staff for institutional research may be small. But research must be the responsibility of someone.

Because parents have traditionally expected the junior college, and particularly the church-related college, to protect and to guide their sons and daughters, it is easy for the college to assume a role *in loco parentis*. Whether this was ever an appropriate relationship for the institution is questioned by many today. Whether it is even possible today also is being questioned. Because the students are young—all freshmen or sophomores—it is easy to assume that they are immature and inexperienced. However, many students are better read, more widely traveled, and more knowledgeable than students only a few years ago. It is true that many students do come to the junior college from small communities and may even for a time return to such communities. But with 85 percent of our population expected to be living in the urban community if not in the larger megopolis by 1975, it is more realistic to expect that most of these students will live out their lives in the “secular city.” The question becomes one of how in the very isolated and frequently protected atmosphere which characterizes many developing institutions one can prepare students for confrontation with other members of this very unusual and constantly changing world we are living in. How do the students get to know how young people from other academic communities think? They can read about things in magazines and newspapers, but verbal exchanges are far more effective.

The subtle assumption of immaturity reflects itself in the instruction. As one of the visiting scholars put it, “You don’t become a sophomore by doing freshman work.” Students are to consistently regarded as passive receptors rather than personalities whose healthy development depends on active intellectual and emotional involvement. There is too little confidence in the student’s ability to read for himself and to follow meaningful directions.

As with the need to free the faculty to grow, so too there is the need for the student to be free. He must be encouraged to stretch for goals just out of reach. It is helpful if he can find models in the faculty of what it means to be a thinking, caring person. He must have time free from the demands of his academic responsibilities and the demands of a carefully structured extracurricular program to find what it is to live with himself and to be.

Instructional Methods

Teaching, like playing the violin or cutting hair, is an individual exercise. One can lecture to a thousand people. There are teaching machines which help students and save professorial time. But the education of an individual is something which happens uniquely to him. The moment of insight can happen anywhere—on the football field, in a dormitory bull session, in the

library—but it is more likely to occur between a wise teacher and a sensitive student when a spark leaps from one mind to the other. This is why mass production always cheapens education. This is why academic labor, unlike that of the factory worker, can be made more productive only with great difficulty.⁸

Such confrontation—between a wise teacher and a sensitive student—can occur with greater ease in the small college where the emphasis is on teaching. The question becomes one of how best to create a situation which will maximize the chance that it will occur.

Junior colleges traditionally have admitted students with inadequate academic preparation. The lack of a systematic procedure for diagnosing special difficulties and identifying general deficiencies leads to gearing instruction of competent students to the needs of the poorest, or at least to addressing the instruction to the lowest common denominator. Students critically deficient should be identified and either given extra attention or provided with appropriate separate courses of instruction. It should not be assumed that the remedy for deficiencies is more reading or talk by the teacher any more than it is blank filling and other busywork. Diagnostic testing is essential with programmed instruction, tutorials, and learning tapes made easily available to permit students to learn at their own speed. Even in the junior college it is possible to use more advanced and abler students to assist others. More effort is needed to individualize instruction through greater use of the learning resources center.

Emphasis should be placed on the creation of situations in which learning is most likely to occur. The curriculum needs to be rethought in terms of developments in society, the varied needs of students, and more importantly the current accumulation of understanding about how human beings learn. The skills and knowledge of members of the psychology and education faculties can be used to advantage by others.

The faculty needs to be concerned with using in their teaching the current educational media. The concomitant of such use is that the student receives reinforcement to his reading by his professor's practice. A real plan for acquiring, maintaining, introducing staff to, and using such equipment should be established.

Departmental faculties should meet regularly at appropriate intervals to thrash out among themselves topics such as the proper goals of their program and the hierarchies of purpose; the psychology of learning as it

⁸ John W. Nason. "Crises of the University," *Exponent*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Federal Reserve Bank, December 1970), p. 3.

applies to their field and productive tactics in teaching; the optimal use of campus and community resources (such as library, bookstore, activities in other departments, learning resources center, the local cinema, and the like) for the benefit of their students; the problem of critically deficient students; the kinds of testing that provide educational experiences that are most useful; and other matters on which either common policy is desirable or interchange of ideas advantageous.

Perhaps the greatest concern must be expressed for the continued and too frequent use of traditional teaching methods and the lack of experimentation. Better use of the classroom might be made if the gross amount of common reading required was reduced and the emphasis placed on sharpening the concern with understanding, appreciation, and individual initiative in following up particular interests. Rather than imparting facts, the lecturer might better be used to stimulate interest, make connections, supply well-ordered presentation of matters students are not expected to discover for themselves, and direct the reading and other activities of class members.

One means of taking the student out of the classroom to broaden his base of learning is to make better use of the library and bookstore. The student is not likely to involve himself in library research if the assignments are all directed to the textbook. It is essential to give assignments which require library search. The availability of contemporary literature and paperback books in the bookstore encourages students to begin to develop their own libraries and to find some joy in reading. Faculty members responsible for areas of specialization should be specifically responsible for upgrading and keeping current the library holdings related to their specialization.

Theodore Newcomb has been writing for years about what he has termed peer group influence. He says that much of what students learn they learn outside the classroom, from one another. Increasingly, students in their search for relevance have moved off the campus. They have frequently led the way in the establishment of the free university. We need to recognize the necessity of increased field experiences as a means of providing the student with opportunities to apply their academic acquisitions as they test and enlarge these acquisitions. Recognition is taken of existing use both as related to the classroom and in extracurricular activities. The push is for more creative use of the larger community as an environment for learning. One suggestion which has only been explored tentatively is the area of cooperation with other

institutions. Joint appointments, adjunct professors, and coordinated course and library development all bear thorough examination.

SUMMARY

This report has sought to describe Freed-Hardeman College's effort to improve instruction. Freed-Hardeman defined itself as a developing institution, and by so doing recognized that it was in some real way "out of the mainstream" of American higher education, in part because of limited finances, in part by its location, and in part by earlier lack of funds for advanced study of faculty. The focus of the concern has been with faculty development.

Money was budgeted for study leaves for faculty. With support from the USOE, an initial year's effort established contact with the faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers. Visits were exchanged between faculty members of corresponding departments. The visits and cooperation were continued, though unfunded, throughout 1968-69. The year 1969-70, again with federal support, extended the relationship with Peabody to include members of the faculty of six other institutions in which Freed-Hardeman faculty were pursuing doctoral study. It is with this latter year that this monograph has largely dealt.

The program began with a conference in the fall of 1969. In the spring of 1970 the same group of faculty, administrators, and visiting scholars were brought back together to examine what had been learned. Much of that discussion has been distilled in the preceding section. The spring conference closed with a luncheon address by the Peabody coordinator who attempted to sum up what *had been said* and what *had not been said*. Some of the ideas are shared in this concluding section.

While we had talked much about teaching, the emphasis must be placed on learning. This means that we recognize that it is the student who learns. And all learning involves participation on the part of the learner. There is a need to seek a new role definition for the professor from that of the dispenser of knowledge or more often of facts (which incidentally will soon no longer be accepted as fact) to that of a person who creates an environment for learning and a role model for the student of what it means to be a student. We need both to allow students to learn and to encourage them to learn.

The nature of the collegiate enterprise is concerned with the creative use of the mind, what some have called creative realism. Too little effort has been made to distinguish between training and education. Much, if not most, of what goes on in our classrooms is training. Too much time is spent in reading the textbook and explaining it. Dr. Ohmer Milton, Professor of Psychology at the University of Tennessee, tells of meeting his class on the first day of the quarter and announcing that there would be no lectures. A hand went up and one girl asked, "But Dr. Milton, who will explain the text?" To which he responded, "Have you seen the text?" "No." "Then how do you know it needs explaining?" Too often we sell our students short. They can read. They can think. If not, the classroom is not the place to provide the needed training. But twelve years of experience in elementary and secondary schools has led students to expect and accept this.

We need to help students identify the kinds of questions which need to be asked and to recognize the kinds of questions which cannot be answered in a rational manner. We need to emphasize the limitations of language and to channel the creative interests of students so as to give them a chance to do things on their own—let them do their own thing.

How can this be done? It requires greater participation in class in meaningful discussion at the thinking, feeling, and experiencing level. In mathematics, it means more time at the chalkboard with the chalk in the hands of the students, not the professor. It means that much more learning should take place outside the conventional classroom. My colleagues across the nation talk about the college of 1980's without classrooms, where you learn art in museums, sociology in the city, and child development in day-care centers. The students would tell us to go where the action is. The classroom can best be used to relate theory to practice.

Another concern which was expressed, one which is common to institutions in rural or small-town locations, particularly where there is a strong religious orientation, is that such situations can encourage a kind of isolationism which is restrictive. Students need to be more involved in the social issues of the day not only in terms of the local community but in terms of national and international issues. Libraries and bookstores tend to be filled with "safe" books. More current magazines, newspapers, and other contemporary literature are needed.

Both students and faculty need this stimulation from outside. Faculty members need the opportunity to attend professional meetings. They need to read professional journals. They need the stimulation of discussion in faculty meetings and departmental meetings on what is

important to be learned and what in the discipline is significant. Both students and faculty need greater exposure to a spectrum of ideas and the recognition of the existence of a variety of positions. At times we need to have people come in and "shake us up." We need to be preparing today for tomorrow and for ten years from tomorrow.

It is this that we have been and must continue to be about.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATORS

Dr. John David Thomas, Academic Dean, Freed-Hardeman College

Dr. Ida Long Rogers, Professor of Higher Education and Director, Tennessee College Association Center for Higher Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

VISITING SCHOLARS

Dr. Earl E. Bradley, Chairman of Graduate Studies in Speech, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois

Dr. Kenneth Davis, Jr., Associate Professor of Music, Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas

Dr. Louis E. Dollarhide, Professor of English, University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi

Dr. William J. Griffin, Professor of English, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Willard A. Kerr, Chairman, Department of Psychology, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Dr. James F. Key, Associate Professor of Mathematics and Physics, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Annell Lacy, Assistant Professor of Business Education, Georgia State College, Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Robert A. McQuitty, Assistant Professor of English, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Harry B. Miller, Chairman, Department of Elementary Education, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee, Reading Consultant

Dr. Charles W. Taylor, Chairman, Department of Accountancy, University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi

Dr. Howard W. Tessen, Professor of Modern Languages and Linguistics, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee

FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

Mary D. Bloomingburg, Spanish

Dale Buckley, Business Education

John Bob Hall, Speech and Broadcasting

Thomas H. Holland, Speech

Leonard Johnson, Education and Psychology

Porter King, English

Robert Landon, Mathematics

Joy McDaniel, Reading

James McGill, English

R. C. Oliver, English

Walker Whittle, Business Administration

APPENDIX B

TEACHING IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

An Annotated Bibliography (1960-1970)

Bard, Harry. "Teaching at the Junior College Level: Some Guideposts for the Improvement of Instruction." *Junior College Journal*, 32:437-440, April 1962.

This article presents a list of 40 guidelines suggested by the president of the Baltimore Junior College for the junior college instructor wishing to improve his teaching through its objectives, curriculum, content, planning, instruction and instructor, and materials.

Bean, Alvin T. *Some Comparisons Between Conventional College Teaching Methods and a Composite of Procedures Involving Large Lecture Groups, Seminars, and Reduced Class Time*. North Texas State University (Ed. D. Dissertation), 1969. 151p.

The purpose of this study was to determine differences in achievement, attitude, and critical thinking in junior college freshman subjects that could be attributed to either of two ways of teaching English and history and to use the data to make decisions on pupil deployment and on plant and staff use. The author discusses the implications of this study and offers recommendations concerning further study of the relationship of subject matter, teacher method, and teacher competence to academic achievement.

Bell, Ronald E. *An Analysis of Certain Elements on an Audio-Tape Approach to Instruction*. University of Washington (Ph. D. Dissertation), 1969. 97p.

This study was designed to determine the association between selected variables and an audio-tape approach to instruction. The experimental instructional program was conducted at Shoreline Community College, Seattle, Washington.

Bogdan, James A. "Honors in History: A Junior College Experiment." *Junior College Journal*, 33:185-189, December 1962.

The author reports on his success in teaching an honors course in history at freshman level. Independent reading, oral and written reports replaced the traditional lecture method.

Bonin, Adelyn S. "A Language Laboratory Approach to Teaching English to the Foreign Student." *Junior College Journal*, 31:104-106, October 1960.

The author presents an evaluation of methods of teaching English to foreign students and application of the language laboratory to this specialized teaching problem.

Boyer, Marcia. *Teacher Evaluation: Toward Improving Instruction*. Washington, D.C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970. 4p.

This review of documents on junior college teacher evaluation is concerned with the guidelines and principles for evaluation, criteria for judging instructor

effectiveness, selection of suitable evaluators, and the administration of effective methods of evaluation.

Canavan, Joseph P. "Compensations and Problems of Junior College Training." *Junior College Journal*, 32:509-516, May 1962.

This is a speech presented at the 42nd American Association of Junior Colleges Convention in which the author presents his views concerning the rewards and responsibilities of junior college teaching.

Chance, Clayton W. "Teaching Descriptive Geometry with Colored Transparencies." *Junior College Journal*, 31:465-469, April 1961.

This is a follow-up study on the subject of transparencies in teaching geometry. It contains a tabulation and time sequence breakdown of the production and cost analysis of the colored transparencies.

Cohen, Edward. *Faculty for Teaching-Learning: Proposed New Graduate Centers for the Systematic Preparation for Community College Teachers*. ERIC, 1970. 281p.

The author discusses in-service and preservice programs for junior college instructors at the proposed new graduate centers; special programs related to staffing the programs for career and occupational students; and the variety of services that could be offered to community colleges by the centers.

Collins, John J. "An Experiment in the Use of Teaching Machines." *Junior College Journal*, 33:73-77, October 1962.

The author points out that the programmed course was effective as reflected by student performance, and that the attitudes of students toward automated instruction were overwhelmingly favorable.

Crooke, H. A. "Teaching and the Community College." *Contemporary Education*, 41:38-41, October 1969.

Dannick, Lionel, and Carson, Robert B. "The Seminar Method and the Junior College." *Junior College Journal*, 33:204-209, December 1962.

The authors of this article recognize the limitations and difficulties involved in the use of the seminar, but, based upon their experience with a group at Cazenovia College, they make a plea based upon significant learning gains.

"Emphasis-Toward Greatness in Teaching." *Junior College Journal*, 40:3, June-July 1970.

This editorial summarizes the activities of two summer conferences focused on the creative development of instruction-the Conference on the Problems of Teachers and Teaching in the Two-Year College at Bennett College, Milbrook, New York, and the Seminar for Great Teachers at Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine. Both Conferences were founded by Roger Garrison.

Faculty Work Load: Report of a Survey in Two-Year Colleges. Washington, D.C., National Faculty Association of Community and Junior College, 1970. 10p.

This is a survey of faculty course load requirements and their relationship to the college size, location, and degree of faculty participation in determining their work conditions.

Forbes, Jack D. "Research, Teaching and Excellence." *Junior College Journal*, 37:7-9, December 1966-January 1967.

The author approaches the problem of the widespread belief that scholarly research and excellence in undergraduate teaching are antithetical with the idea that a teacher's competence depends on the times and opportunity available for professional development in both research and teaching skills.

Fredenburgh, Franz A. "Innovating Instruction Through Team Teaching." *Junior College Journal*, 37:12-18, October 1966.

This article discusses problems of different methods of teaching and supports the idea of team teaching in the junior college.

Freligh, Edith A. *Large-Group Instruction in Remedial English*. Huntingdon Beach, California, Golden West College, 1969. 7p.

Follow-up studies reported in this study show that the student who completes the remedial program and proceeds to freshman composition has a better chance of success than the initially qualified student who was not required to enroll in remedial courses.

Garrison, Roger H. "Effective Administration for Superior Teaching." *Junior College Journal*, 32:517-525, May 1962.

The author of this study makes suggestions for the encouragement of superior teaching even though he recognizes the difficulties in defining what is meant by the term. The major activity of a good teacher and that of an ineffective teacher is identified.

Garrison, Roger H. "Reality and Illusion in Teaching." *Junior College Journal*, 34:15-19, February 1964.

The author presents a point of view on teaching which conceives of learning as a genuine involvement in a discipline by both teacher and student.

Garrison, Roger H. "Teaching as Counseling." *Junior College Journal*, 33:12-15, October 1963.

The author views person-to-person counseling as an integral part of each teacher's role. The limitations of this role definition are discussed.

Garrison, Roger H. *Teaching in a Junior College, a Brief Professional Orientation*. Washington, D.C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968. 30p.

The first section of this publication describes the junior college, its structure and governance, its variety of programs and students, its place in higher education,

and its philosophy of instruction. The next section presents a model of a junior college and lists six major concerns of the instructor. The last section offers advice and gives examples of practices, in both method and attitudes, for successful teaching.

Harvey, John F. "The Role of Junior College Library in Classroom Instruction." *Junior College Journal*, 32:441-447, April 1962.

The author describes the Stephens College library program, recommends its emulation, and then makes suggestions for ways for utilizing the library in the instructional program.

Hatch, Winslow. "Research in Class Size in Relationship to Effective Teaching." *Junior College Journal*, 32:21-27, September 1961.

The author identifies and analyzes the elements in class size and teaching effectiveness with working hypotheses formed, and relates the implications for junior colleges.

Improving Instruction in the Two-Year College: Proceedings of a Conference for Two-Year College Teams. Boone, N.C., Appalachian State University. 1969. 86p.

This paper treats the subjects including the needs for clearly stated learning objectives, the nature and implications of the newer instructional media, the improvement of instruction through group dynamics, the needs of the two-year college student, etc.

Ivey, Nathan A. "The Part-time Instructor and Effective Teaching." *Junior College Journal*, 31:40-43, September 1960.

A discussion of proposals and recommendations for the recruitment, selection, orientation, in-service training, and an evaluation of part-time professors in higher education.

Johnson, B. Lamar, ed. *New Direction for Instruction in the Junior College*. Occasional Report No. 7, Junior College Leadership Program. Los Angeles, California, School of Education, University of California, 1965. 132p.

A collection of reports presented at the National Conference on New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College, in 1964 includes: New Directions, Case Studies, Programmed Instruction, and Television in Instruction.

Kilpatrick, Gordon. *A Consideration of Teaching Load in American Junior Colleges*. Los Angeles, University of California, 1967. 22p.

The author suggests a teaching load measurement formula to equalize the load credit given to teachers of various kinds of classes in terms of number of preparations, course differences, class size, clerical assistance, student advising, committee work, and overload.

Kinsinger, Robert E. "Stretching Instructional Talent." *Junior College Journal*, 35:22-25, October 1964.

The author reports a pioneering experimentation with closed-circuit television

for clinical instruction. The development of a relatively inexpensive videotape recorder should stimulate junior colleges to more experimentation.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. *The Two-Year College and the Teaching of English*. A Report of the Incoming President of the National Council of Teachers of English to the Executive Committee, November, 1963. Champaign, Ill., National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

This report, based on a survey of 215 junior colleges, describes the junior college and its educational objectives. General suggestions for the improvement of the two-year college and the teaching of English are furnished.

Kuhns, Eileen P. "Part-time Faculty." *Junior College Journal*, 33:8-12, January 1963.

The author presents many reasons why the part-time instructor is a vitalizing influence in junior college teaching. Especially noteworthy is the reference to retired people who bring to the classroom a lifetime of experience and exercise in a specialized field.

McVay, Donald R. *Videotaped Instruction for the Teaching of Skills*. Seattle, Shoreline Community College, 1969. 16p.

The author attempts to compare the effectiveness of videotaped segments with that of conventional teaching methods through an experimentation conducted at Shoreline Community College. It was concluded that wider use of videotaped instruction for the teaching of skill would be beneficial.

Merson, Thomas B. "Commission Commitments: Commission on Instruction." *Junior College Journal*, 33:26-28, February 1962.

This report of the Commission on Instruction of the AAJC indicated an interest in (1) problems of remedial or repair teaching, (2) problems of stimulating an increased supply of well-prepared junior college teachers, and (3) instructional problems encountered by new junior college faculty.

Merson, Thomas B. "Commission Commitments: Instruction Improvement Workshops." *Junior College Journal*, 4:19, October 1963.

This article reports on success of a workshop on the improvement of instruction held at Pennett College, June 16-22, 1963, and the organization of other workshops in other sections of the nation.

Monaco, Lawrence H. "Teaching Biology in the Junior College.." *American Biology Teacher*, 27:30-32, January 1965.

This article deals with the role taken by Dutchess Community College, Poughkeepsie, New York, in teaching biology and the related sciences to junior college students.

O'Connor, Edward F., Jr., and Justiz, Thomas B. *Identifying the Effective Instructor*. Los Angeles, University of California, 1970, 34p.

This paper describes the application of Justiz's measure of general teaching (1968) to junior college instructors. The procedure for conducting the study is presented in detailed form.

Pessen, Edward. "How Does the Professor Spend His Time?" *Junior College Journal*, 32:280-283, January 1962.

The author points out the heavy load of assignments required to the junior college instructors. The average professor (in the author's department at Staten Island Community College, New York) spent more than 40 hours per week in preparation for and teaching of classes, counseling students, and extracurricular assignments.

Peterson, Basil H. "An Experiment in Large Class Instruction." *Junior College Journal*, 31:74-77, October 1960.

The author describes the method of planning, implementing and evaluating an experimental large class in U.S. history at Orange Coast College in California.

Pyle, Gordon B. "Strengthening the Junior College Teaching Profession." *Junior College Journal*, 32:526-533, May 1962.

A speech presented at the 42nd American Association of Junior Colleges Convention points out the need for change in the pace and posture of junior college instruction and explains ways of how to accomplish this.

Rapp, Marvin A. "Making Teaching More Effective." *Improving College and University Teaching*, 9:163-165, Autumn, 1961.

This article contains a description of a program coordinated by the State University of New York to improve the various community colleges. In the author's opinion, no matter how effective the teaching may be, it can always be improved.

A Report to the Commission on Instruction of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970. 20p.

This report focuses on the development of a rationale and of a tentative set of guidelines for evaluating community junior college instruction.

Roberts, John L. "A Plan to Abandon Teaching Facts." *Junior College Journal*, 35:23, March 1965.

An experience with an electronic teaching device at Bradford Junior College suggests we may be able to abandon the teaching of facts and the demonstration of scientific equipment during lecture and laboratory time.

Roueche, John E.. "Superior Teaching in Junior Colleges: Research Needed." *Improving College and University Teaching*, 16:33-35, Winter, 1968.

The author points out that effective institutional research programs are the results of a commitment to the need for research as a prerequisite to instructional planning.

Sarko, Laura. "The Problem of Teaching in the Community Colleges." *Journal of Higher Education*, 35:384-386, October 1964.

The author presents a brief discussion of the problem of academic freedom for faculty in community colleges. Sarko feels that until they are freed from high school chores, the faculty will not function effectively as teachers and scholars.

Schulman, Benson R. *Teaching the High Ability, Low Achieving Student: Individualized Instruction in Action; An Attack on Human Isolation*. Washington, D.C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. 31p.

Shugrue, Michael F. "The National Study of English in the Junior College." *Junior College Journal*, 40:8-12, June-July 1970.

An abridged report on a cooperative study of the preparation of junior college English instructors conducted jointly by the Modern Language Association, the National Council on Teacher Education, and AAJC, 1968-1969. Three principal goals were defined: (1) to involve every junior college English instructor in the United States in the dialog; (2) to provide an authoritative profile of the junior college English instructor and department; and (3) to make recommendations to improve the pre- and in-service preparation of junior college English instructors. This article summarizes major findings of the study and recommendations.

Solomon, Roger B. "Preparation for Teaching in Two-Year Colleges." *Improving College and University Teaching*, 16:125-127, Spring 1968.

The author proposes performance level and improved preparation for teachers in two-year colleges, including in-service programs, summer study, and institutes.

Swets, Marinus M. "Instruction in a Junior College Freshmen English Honors Class." *Junior College Journal*, 32:448-453, April 1962.

The author discusses the material and the techniques that he used in teaching an honors class in freshmen English at Grand Rapids Junior College. Certain tentative conclusions were drawn about its success.

Tickton, Sidney G. "The Experimentation Needed in Teaching Larger Number of Students." *Junior College Journal*, 32:12-20, September 1961.

Attention is focused on modern teaching innovations, curriculum, audio-visual aids, and the physical plant.

Voegel, Georg H. *Update 1: A Report of the Beginning Efforts in Instructional Development at William Rainey Harper College*. Palatine, Ill., William Rainey Harper College, 1970. 124p.

This is a report of a 6-week summer workshop on instructional development which took place at William Rainey Harper College in 1968 relating to developing instructional concepts, objectives, and strategies and tactics that will help achieve the objectives.

Waters, William R. "Faculty Load in Colleges and Universities in the Chicago Area." *College and University*, 39:325-330, Spring 1964.

This is a study of the number of courses taught and the extent of related duties of the faculty in 12 junior colleges and 24 senior colleges and universities in the Chicago area.

Wetzler, Wilson F. "Teaching Values in the Junior College Classroom." *Junior College Journal*, 31:421-426, April 1961.

The author explains some methods that may be employed for teaching of changing values.